REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-21 have been amended. Thus, claims 1-21 are pending in the present application, of which claims 1, 8, and 15 are independent.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 8, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U. S. Pat. No. 6,961,783 issued to Cook et al. (hereinafter referred to as Cook).

INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1

As an example, independent claim 1 recites (among other things) the following feature:

> an identifying unit configured to identify, when a query about an address corresponding to a name of a communication destination is received from a communication source, which of a private network address and a global network address a source address of the communication source is and which of a private network address and a global network address a destination address of the communication destination is; ...

As will be explained below, at least this feature of claim 1 provide distinctions over Cook.

Item 5 of the Office Action asserts that Cook teaches the noted feature of claim 1. Column 5, lines 1-34 of Cook recites the following.

> The individual name servers for each domain name, such as company.com, contain detailed address information for the hosts in that domain. The DNS server then asks the company.com server for the name of the server that handles the company.com domain. Finally, this most specific name server supplies the DNS server with the IP address of the URL. In a conventional DNS transaction, a client seeks an IP address from a given host from any server that the client knows about. These servers recursively forward the request to higher-level servers until a reply is received, which is forwarded back to the original client.

> The DNS server of the present invention allows only clients that are approved by the DNS server to receive responses. As shown in FIG. 2, the DNS server 22 includes an access control list (ACL) 26. The ACL table lists a plurality of URLs and specifies for at least some of the URLs which clients can have access to the IP address of the URL. For example, the ACL table 26 of FIG. 2 includes Darpa.mil, ATT.com, and Yahoo.com. There is no

corresponding list of authorized users for ATT.com or Yahoo.com, thus, the corresponding IP addresses are accessible to anyone that requests them. The IP address for Darpa.mil, however, is accessible only to mil users. The DNS server 22 may require that the user submit the request with a digital signature so that the DNS server can verify that the requester is actually a mil user. The originating client 24 may also send an encrypted request to the DNS server 22. It is to be understood that the ACL table 26 may have different configurations than described above, without departing from the scope of the invention. For example, if no clients are listed, all clients may be denied access (rather than all being allowed access). Also, listed clients may either be all allowed access or all denied access.

Column 6, line 61 to column 7, line 7 of Cook recites the following.

> Communication between computers within the network is made possible with the use of communication protocols, which govern how computers exchange information over a network. The computer may include an input/output circuit used to communicate information in appropriately structured form to and from the parts of computer and associated equipment. Connected to the input/output circuit are inside and outside high speed Local Area Network interfaces 54, for example. The inside interface may be connected to a private network, while the outside interface may be connected to an external network such as the Internet. Preferably, each of these interfaces includes a plurality of ports appropriate for communication with the appropriate media, and associated logic, and in some instances memory.

However, Cook does not disclose, teach, or suggest the identifying **which of** a **private network address** and a **global network address** a <u>source address</u> of the communication source is. Further, Cook does not disclose, teach, or suggest the identifying **which of** a **private network address** and a **global network address** a <u>destination address</u> of the communication destination is.

Hence, claim 1 distinguishes over Cook at least because of the above-noted feature, namely:

> an identifying unit configured to identify, when a query about an address corresponding to a name of a communication destination is received from a communication source, which of a private network address and a global network address a source address of the communication source is and which of a private network address and a global network address a destination address of the communication destination is; ...

10

Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim. In view of the distinction of claim 1 noted above, at least one claimed element is not present in Cook. Hence, Cook does not anticipate claim 1.

Claims 8 and 15 recite (among other things) feature similar to the above noted feature of claim 1.

In view of the foregoing discussion, the rejection of claims 1, 8, and 15 is improper. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 2, 3, 9, 10, 16, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook in view of U. S. Pub. No. 2003/0172145 issued to Nguyen (hereinafter referred to as Nguyen).

Claims 4-7, 11-14, and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook in view of Nguyen and further in view of U. S. Pat. No. 7,093,288 issued to Hydrie et al. (hereinafter referred to as Hydrie).

However, claims 2-7 ultimately depend from claim 1, respectively, and so at least similarly distinguish over Cook. The above-noted feature also is a distinction over Nguyen and Hydrie as evidenced, e.g., by the Office Action. That is, the Office Action does not assert Nguyen and Hydrie as disclosing the above noted feature(s) of claim 1.

Among other things, a *prima facie* case of obviousness must establish that the asserted combination of references teaches or suggests each and every element of the claimed invention. In view of the distinction of claim 1 noted above, at least one claimed element is not present in the asserted combination of references. Hence, the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness vis-à-vis claim 1. Claims 2-7 ultimately depend from claim 1, respectively, and so at least similarly distinguish over the asserted combination of references.

Claims 9-14 and 16-21 recite (among other things) feature similar to the feature of claims 2-7.

In view of the foregoing discussion, the rejection of claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-21 is improper. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections of record and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would assist in resolving any issues pertaining to the allowability of the above-identified application, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Please grant any required extensions of time and charge any fees due in connection with this request to deposit account no. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

/Mehdi D. Sheikerz/

Date: _____April 20, 2009_____   By: _____
Mehdi D. Sheikerz
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501